

Appln. No.: 10/090,877
Amendment Dated July 22, 2005
Reply to Office Action of April 22, 2005

MATP-609US

Remarks/Arguments:

Claims 1-20 are pending in the above-identified application. Claims 1, 2, 5, 8-10, and 14-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of Kim and Shintani et al. This ground for rejection is overcome by the amendment to claims 1, 9 and 16 to include the features claimed in dependent claims 6, 13, and 20, respectively. Additional basis for this amendment may be found at paragraphs [0055] and [0044] of the subject application. In particular, neither Kim, Shintani et al. nor their combination discloses or suggests,

a processor in the electronic device that, in response to a signal from a remote control device, generates image pattern information to be displayed as an on-screen display (OSD);

a transmitter in the electronic device that transmits the image pattern information as an OSD information signal that includes menu information including a plurality of options; and

a remote control unit, comprising:

...

an input device for selecting one option from among the plurality of options when the menu information is displayed; and

a transmitter for transmitting information concerning the selected option to the electronic device

as required by amended claim 1,

generating, in the electronic device, in response to a signal from a remote control device, image pattern on-screen display (OSD) menu information including a plurality of options to be displayed as an OSD;

...

selecting one option from among the plurality of options when the menu information is displayed; and

transmitting information concerning the selected option to the electronic device,

as required by amended claim 9 or,

receiving the image pattern OSD information signal generated by the electronic device in response to a signal from the remote control unit;

receiving a selection of one option from among the plurality of options when the menu information is displayed; and

Appln. No.: 10/090,877
Amendment Dated July 22, 2005
Reply to Office Action of April 22, 2005

MATP-609US

transmitting information concerning the selected option to the electronic device

as required by amended claim 16.

The Applicant maintains that neither Kim, Shintani et al., nor their combination disclose the previously amended features of generating "in response to a signal from a remote control unit, image pattern information to be displayed as an on-screen display (OSD) " that is transmitted to a remote control unit. The present Office Action claims "Kim clearly states that 'the display displays images together with predetermined OSD pattern data provided by the OSD generator,'" thereby asserting that Kim does indeed disclose the remote control as displaying image pattern data. However, paragraph [0101] in Kim, to which the Office Action refers, describes a "broadcasting receiver set" (see paragraph [0094]) such as a television set, for example, as displaying images in addition to an OSD. Kim nowhere discloses a **remote control device** that receives image pattern data to be displayed as an OSD. In fact, Kim discloses in paragraph [0036]-[0040] that the "EPG remote controller" receives paging data (**NOT** from the television set, but from a paging network such as an FM DARC), which clearly does not conform to an OSD. Accordingly, Kim neither discloses that the remote control device receives image pattern data, nor does it disclose that the image pattern data is transmitted from an electronic device that receives commands from the remote control.

The Office Action then states that "transmitting OSD information is clearly taught by Shintani" and that Shintani et al. make numerous references to the term OSD. The Office Action asserts that since "OSD which obscures the picture on the television set 101 is unnecessary" (col. 5, l. 5-7), that Shintani et al. necessarily disclose sending said OSD to the remote control device. The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this logic. The only reason that the OSD is no longer necessary in Shintani et al. is because they disclose transmitting EPG data to the remote control device, thereby precluding the need to have the television form an OSD for the television set, since it's passing the EPG data straight to the remote control (see, e.g., col. 4, l. 54-63). The Office Action also asks "if OSD in Shintani is not produced on the television receiver, then how the OSD in Shintani can transmit to control unit from the television set." Shintani et al. preferably **don't** produce the OSD on the television set (since it takes up space on the screen), and therefore **don't** transmit the OSD from the television set to the control unit. Only EPG data are transmitted.

Appln. No.: 10/090,877
Amendment Dated July 22, 2005
Reply to Office Action of April 22, 2005

MATP-609US

Neither Kim nor Shintani et al. disclose or suggest transmitting an OSD as the term would be understood by one of ordinary skill in the art. Instead, both of these references teach transmitting **data** which may be used to generate a display on the remote control device. An On-Screen Display or OSD is an image formatted for display on a display screen. An electronic program guide or EPG, on the other hand, is data describing available programming content. The term EPG does not in any way imply a formatted image. The subject invention is advantageous because the image pattern for the OSD is developed in the electronic device and transmitted to the remote control device. This greatly simplifies the remote control device as it does not need to generate the image pattern for the OSD but only receive and display the image pattern information that was generated by the electronic device.

In the interest of expediting the approval of the present invention, however, independent claims 1, 9, and 16 are amended to include the menu feature of respective dependent claims 6, 13, and 20. Claims 6, 13, and 20 are canceled and claim 7 is amended to depend from claim 1. The Examiner agrees that "Kim and Shintani do not mention OSD including menu information." Nevertheless, claims 6, 7, 13 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of Kim, Shintani et al. and Dunaway.

Dunaway concerns a multimodal remote control device having electrically alterable keypad designations. The remote control device described by Dunaway has a single format. All that is changed in the different modes of the remote control device is the text in the center 22 of the display or the buttons 24-42 on the sides of the display. (See column 4, lines 10-25). These text items are conveyed as **data** during a learning mode, as described at column 5, lines 42-48. As with Kim and Shintani et al., Dunaway does not disclose or suggest sending or receiving **image pattern** OSD information that may comprise menu information including a plurality of options. In addition, Dunaway does not disclose or suggest "generating" any OSD information in the electronic device. Instead, in Dunaway, the data that is transferred by Dunaway is pre-existing and is transferred only in the learning mode (see col. 5, lines 43-56). Furthermore, the data is not generated by the electronic device "in response to a signal from the remote control device," As stated above, this feature also isn't disclosed in Kim or Shintani et al.. Accordingly, claims 1, 9 and 16 are not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Kim and Shintani et al., they are also not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Kim, Shintani et al., and Dunaway. Claims 2-5 and 7-8 depend from claim 1, claims 10-12 and 14-15 depend from claim 9, and claims 17-19 depend from claim 16. Accordingly,

Appln. No.: 10/090,877
Amendment Dated July 22, 2005
Reply to Office Action of April 22, 2005

MATP-609U5

these claims are not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for at least the same reasons as their base claims.

Claims 3, 4, 11, 12, 18 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of Kim, Shintani et al. and Horton. This ground for rejection is overcome by the amendments to claims 1, 9 and 16, described above. Kim and Shintani et al. are described above. Horton concerns an on-screen display for an MPEG video signal processing system. Similar to Kim and Shintani et al., however, Horton does not disclose a remote control device and, so, can not disclose or suggest sending any image pattern information from the MPEG video signal processing system to a remote control device. Thus, Horton can not provide the material that is missing from Kim and Shintani et al. Consequently, claims 1, 9 and 16 are not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Kim, Shintani et al. and Horton and, thus, claims 3 and 4, which depend from claim 1, claims 11 and 12 which depend from claim 9 and claims 18 and 19 which depend from claim 16 are not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Kim, Shintani et al., and Horton for at least the same reasons as their base claims.


Claims 6, 7, 13 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim in view of Shintani and Dunaway. With respect to claims 6, 13 and 20, this ground for rejection is overcome by the cancellation of these claims. With regard to claim 7, this ground for rejection is overcome for the reasons set forth above with regard to the rejection of claim 1, from which claim 7 depends. As set forth above, claim 1 was amended to include the limitations of claim 6.

Appln. No.: 10/090,877
Amendment Dated July 22, 2005
Reply to Office Action of April 22, 2005

MATP-609US

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the final rejection of claims 1-5, 7-12, and 13-19.

Respectfully submitted,


Kenneth N. Nigon, Reg. No. 31,549
Attorney(s) for Applicant(s)

KNN/tmb


Dated: July 22, 2005

P.O. Box 980
Valley Forge, PA 19482
(610) 407-0700

The Commissioner for Patents is hereby authorized to charge payment to Deposit Account No. 18-0350 of any fees associated with this communication.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office (571)273-8300 on the date shown below.

July 22, 2005


Tonya M. Berger